

L-208



COMMENT CARD

PLACER COUNTY WATER AGENCY/U.S. BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PCWA AMERICAN RIVER PUMP STATION AND RIVER RESTORATION PROJECT
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

NAME:	Wallace B & Rosanna Everson
ADDRESS:	1735 Vista Del Monte
CITY/STATE/ZIP:	Auburn CA 95603
BUSINESS AND/OR HOME PHONE/FAX:	(530) 887-9424
ORGANIZATION (IF APPLICABLE):	N/A or Monticielo Homeowners Assn.
COMMENTS:	
November 9, 2001	
Draft EIS/EIR Comments	
Surface Water Resources, Inc.	
2031 Howe Avenue, Suite 110	
Sacramento, CA 95823	
As a homeowner in Monticielo Subdivision just off Maidu Drive, I do not question the proposed	
PCWA Pump Station or the restoration of the American River to it's historical channel. Neither do	
I have a problem with the development of recreational facilities along the river since I see each of the	
fore mentioned proposals as reasonable for the area in question. I am, however, VERY concerned	
with the proposal to designate Maidu Drive as public access to the river for the following but	
certainly not all inclusive reasons:	

PLEASE USE THIS TO SUBMIT YOUR COMMENTS ABOUT THE DRAFT EIS/EIR. YOU CAN SEND ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO:
DRAFT EIS/EIR COMMENTS, SURFACE WATER RESOURCES, INC., 2031 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 110, SACRAMENTO, CA 95825
JUST FOLD THIS SELF-ADDRESSED SHEET INTO THIRDS, SEAL, STAMP, AND MAIL. THANK YOU.
☒ Please check here if you would like to be on the project mailing list.

Comments: Draft ESI/EIR
 Page 2
 November 9, 2001
 Wallace B. Everson

- A** • Maidu Drive is not a COMMERCIAL street. It is a COLLECTOR street in a RESIDENTIAL neighborhood. Homeowners in the area took this into consideration at time of purchase of their respective homes. Opening Maidu Drive to commercial traffic, such as rafting service companies, would have dramatic impact on the current and continuing peace and tranquility of those homeowners who sought out that environment when selecting the neighborhood in which they chose to live
- B** • The estimated 210 car increase in private vehicles on "peak days" is misleading. Those 210 cars would ingress AND egress meaning an additional 420 traffic movements on Maidu.
- With recreational parking for only 60 cars, overflow parking would impact the neighborhoods in the immediate vicinity (US)
- C** • Access from Maidu onto Auburn-Folsom Road is currently crowded and difficult at peak hours of the day. With additional traffic movements, a traffic signal would certainly be in order for the intersection and should be part of the equation BEFORE, DURING and not AFTER all other considerations
- Additional traffic ALWAYS results in additional trash and garbage cast out of vehicles along the traveled way and which would adversely affect property values
- D** • Access to the river ALREADY EXISTS via State Highway 49. Additional access with minimal impact to local residents can and should be developed from the scenic overlook above the dam site

In summary, one only need look as far as Hwy 89 at Fanny Bridge in Tahoe City to observe first hand the enormous traffic bottlenecks that develop EVERY DAY ALL SUMMER LONG where traffic and recreational facilities share the same space. We do not want or need that on Maidu Drive.

Thank you for your studied attention to the foregoing concerns.

Sincerely,

Wallace B. Everson

Wallace B. Everson
 1735 Vista Del Monte
 Auburn, CA 95603
 (530)887-9424

- A.** Reclamation constructed Maidu Drive to serve as a construction access and haul route for the Auburn Dam project. The City of Auburn General Plan identifies Maidu Drive as a collector road. The public river access features associated with the Proposed Project do not include use of the area by commercial rafting companies; CDPR is not proposing or permitting commercial rafting use in this section of the river, as part of this project. Please refer to Master Response 3.1.6, Public River Access Features.
- B.** The Draft EIS/EIR describes the number of parking spaces and associated vehicle trips. A trip is defined as traveling one way to or from the site, with the origination and destination points of each trip located outside the City of Auburn (page 3-290); therefore, the estimate of vehicle trips includes the ingress and egress movements. Please also refer to Master Response 3.1.6, Public River Access Features.
- C.** The City of Auburn plans to install a traffic signal at the Maidu Drive/Auburn-Folsom Road intersection later this year (2002). Additionally, it is noted that project-related traffic generally would not coincide with peak commute and school-related traffic.
- D.** Please refer to Master Response 3.1.6, Public River Access Features and Master Response 3.1.10, Project Access.

November 13, 2001

American River Pump Station Project, Draft EIR/EIS Comments
 Surface Water Resources, Inc.
 2031 Howe Ave., Suite 110
 Sacramento, CA 95825
 Fax: (916) 286-0957

As I did not receive notice of the proposed November 7, 2001 Information Session re: the Auburn Dam Diversion Tunnel Closure and AR restoration project in time to voice my comments, the following are presented by fax.

As a recent new owner of property in Auburn (i.e., Monteciello Development), I am against these projects. I purchased the property in Auburn with the purpose of retiring in a quiet community dedicated to the quality of life.

A

Auburn is known as a "bedroom" community with a large population of retired or semi-retired residents. Who is to pay for these additional projects? The retired do not need additional tax burdens and would not utilize these recreational activities. Young people do not need the additional tax burdens with all the recent and on-going job losses in our present economic situation.

B

A new entrance station is not needed; use the existing one (Pacific?) where ~~residential~~ impact would be at minimal.

Environmental impact:

- . Increase in traffic and noise.
- . Increased hazard for people already using Maidu Dr. for exercise (running, walking, etc.).
- C . Increased hazard for children crossing Maidu Dr. for school.
- . Garbage/trash dumping.
- . Increased people bring drugs, smoking and loitering problems.
- D . A big item - ADDITIONAL FIRE HAZARDS.
- . Dump for vehicles.
- C . General criminal activities.

NOV-13-01 TUE 5:00 PM

P. 1

- A. Please refer to Master Response 3.1.2, American River Pump Station Project Funding.
- B. Please refer to Master Response 3.1.10, Project Access.
- C. Please refer to Master Response 3.1.6, Public River Access Features.
- D. Please refer to Master Response 3.1.9, Fire Management.

NOV-13-2001 05:42 PM

P.02

November 13, 2001
Page 2

Re: Auburn Dam Diversion Tunnel Closure, etc.

C (cont)

- . Hours of operation.
- . Overnight camping problems.
- . Policing of operation for safety of users as well as near-by residents.
- . Increased safety for playing children in area.

Having unknown people coming into residential communities presents many opportunities for criminal activities.

As I stated previously I am against this project. BUT, if it does progress, at least use an area that is not through residential neighborhoods.


J. L. Taylor

NOV-13-01 TUE 5:01 PM

P. 2

L-210

November 13, 2001

American River Pump Station Project
Draft EIS/EIR Comments
c/o Surface Water Resources, Inc.
2031 Howe Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95825

Gentlepeople:

I support the No Project/No Action alternative described in the draft EIS/EIR for the American River Pump Station Project for the following reasons:

A

Purpose: The project is simply not necessary. In terms of safety for boaters or other users of the river, no accidents or incidents in the history of the tunnel suggest that the proposed action of tunnel closure is justified. Documents mentioned in the draft that supposedly define a safety issue were unavailable for reference and are suspect. Other rivers such as the Etowah in Georgia incur highly popular use for boating through tunnels without safety problems. It is inconceivable that the project sponsors have suddenly realized a safety issue on this site after so many years without problems. In terms of water supply, the existing seasonal diversion and the Sacramento River and groundwater sources are sufficient to support a reasonable level of development within the PCWA service area at a more favorable cost per unit of water and lower energy costs. The Bureau of Reclamation should exercise its option to supply alternative sources to meet the basic requirements under Article 11 of the Land Purchase Agreement with PCWA.

B

C

D

Safety and Convenience: Thousands of hikers, equestrians, mountain bikers, and runners use trails that would be closed by the proposed alternative. If the tunnel crossing is closed, and the trail partly buried by rock debris as proposed, the Western States Trail (WST) will become overused and congested to the point of presenting a seriously dangerous situation as well as maintenance problems. The WST is narrow, steep, and rocky single-track that cannot serve the volumes or types of traffic that the tunnel crossing serves. People and horses will be at a much greater risk for potentially deadly accidents involving collisions and falls on the WST. The loss of a trail crossing at the tunnel site would incur additional safety problems when visitors attempt to negotiate the slippery rocks on the river bed there along with fluctuating flows.

Aesthetics: The project proposes to pile vast volumes of loose rock material onto slopes adjacent to the river in the dominant view of trails users, boaters, and the Overlook. The proposed design makes no provision for planting such unsightly areas. This 'dumping' concept would degrade the value of the area for visitors and for the community.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Uriel Diaz
1025 University Ave #93
Sacramento, CA 95825

- A. Please refer to Master Response 3.1.4, Auburn Dam Construction Bypass Tunnel.
- B. PCWA demonstrates their need for increased surface water supplies, including from their Middle Fork Project water entitlement on the American River, in the Surface Water Supply Update for Western Placer County Discussion Paper (March 2001). Please also refer to Response L-21.A.
- C. Please refer to Master Response 3.1.1, Auburn-to-Cool Trail.
- D. Please refer to Master Response 3.1.5, Project Area River Restoration.

L-211

FAX - 916-286-0957

To

American River Pump Station Project
Surface Water Resources Inc.
2031 Howe Ave. Suite #110
Sacramento, Ca. 95825

From

William & Natalie Jareel
305 Riverview Dr.
Auburn, Ca. 95603

Nov. 13, 2001

SUBJECT

Comments on Draft
EIS/EIR for the
American River Pump
Station Project

P.01

NOV-13-2001 02:51 PM

We have some serious concerns that we feel need to be addressed in regard to the EIS/EIR for the American River Pump Station Project.

- A. ① Property owners on the canyon side of Riverview are already impacted on our private property with joggers, bike riders, walkers, and classes of school children. All of this takes place on water agency canal maintenance trail.
- B. ② Any sounds in the canyon are amplified, whether it is construction, recreation, horses, joggers, motorized bikes, etc.
- C. ③ Who will be in charge of order and enforcement of this area? The hours of operation need to be regulated and also include a locked gate.

A. Please refer to Response L-185.B.

B. As noted in the Draft EIS/EIR (Chapter 3, Section 3.16, Noise), Reclamation's construction contractor would be required to comply with current City of Auburn, Placer County, and El Dorado County noise ordinance standards. Please also refer to Master Response 3.1.6, Public River Access Features.

C. CDPR would be responsible for the management and enforcement of all rules, regulations, and posted orders related to the public river access features and public use of the area. These activities would include restricting vehicular access according to set hours of operation and locking the entrance gate when the area is closed. Please also refer to Master Response 3.1.6, Public River Access Features.